

## APPENDIX

[TAA petitions instituted between 1/5/09 and 1/9/09]

TA-W	Subject firm (petitioners)	Location	Date of institution	Date of petition
64807	Versa Diecast, Inc. (State)	New Hope, MN	01/05/09	12/31/08
64808	Fiskars Brands, Inc. (Comp)	Wausau, WI	01/05/09	12/29/08
64809	S & B Industry Technologies, L.P. (Comp)	Fort Worth, TX	01/05/09	01/02/09
64810	Legere Group, Ltd. dba Legere Woodworking (State)	Avon, CT	01/05/09	12/05/08
64811	Clayton Marcus Company—Plant 1—Bethlehem (Comp)	Hickory, NC	01/06/09	12/29/08
64812	LuK USA LLC (Comp)	Wooster, OH	01/06/09	12/19/08
64813	Gerber Scientific, Inc. (State)	Tolland, CT	01/06/09	01/05/09
64814	PPM Technologies, Inc. (Wkrs)	Newberg, OR	01/06/09	12/30/08
64815	Pittsburgh Corning Corporation (Union)	Port Allegany, PA	01/06/09	01/05/09
64816	Northwest Aluminum Specialties (USW)	The Dalles, OR	01/06/09	12/19/08
64817	Boise, Inc. (AWPPW)	St. Helens, OR	01/07/09	12/17/08
64818	Concept Packaging Group (Comp)	Griffin, GA	01/07/09	01/06/09
64819	Teck-Washington, Inc. (Comp)	Metaline Falls, WA	01/07/09	01/06/09
64820	Tenneco Automotive (Comp)	Evansville, IN	01/07/09	01/06/09
64821	Cone Jacquards, LLC—An ITG Company (Comp)	Cliffside, NC	01/07/09	01/06/09
64822	Pulaski Furniture Corporation (Wkrs)	Pulaski, VA	01/07/09	01/06/08
64823	Martin Transportation Systems (Wkrs)	Huber Heights, OH	01/07/09	12/29/08
64824	IACNA (Wkrs)	Lebanon, VA	01/07/09	12/29/08
64825	Briggs-Shaffner Company (Comp)	Simpsonville, SC	01/07/09	12/22/08
64826	Thomasville Furniture Industries, Inc. (Comp)	Thomasville, NC	01/07/09	01/06/09
64827	Thomasville Furniture Industries, Ind.—Plant E (Comp)	Thomasville, NC	01/07/09	01/06/09
64828	Thomasville Furniture Industries, Ind.—Upholstery 5 (Comp)	Conover, NC	01/07/09	01/06/09
64829	Cooper Tire and Rubber Company (Comp)	Albany, GA	01/07/09	01/05/09
64830	Philips Lumileds Lighting Company (Comp)	San Jose, CA	01/08/09	01/07/09
64831	ATC Panels, Inc. (Comp)	Morrisville, NC	01/08/09	01/07/09
64832	Photronics (Comp)	Boise, ID	01/08/09	01/07/09
64833	Carrier Corporation (SMWIA)	Tyler, TX	01/08/09	01/07/09
64834	Regal Beloit (Wkrs)	West Plains, MO	01/08/09	01/05/09
64835	Logistics Services (Wkrs)	Dayton, OH	01/08/09	12/26/08
64836	Black Dot Group (Comp)	Winter Park, FL	01/08/09	01/07/09
64837	Bill Blass International (UNITE)	New York, NY	01/09/09	12/23/08
64838	Cosby National Swage (State)	Jacksonville, AR	01/09/09	01/08/09
64839	Sony Technology Center-Pittsburgh (Comp)	Mt. Pleasant, PA	01/09/09	01/09/09
64840	International Paper (AFLCIO)	Cleveland, TN	01/09/09	12/18/08
64841	MAR/TRON, Inc. (State)	Flippin, AR	01/09/09	01/08/09
64842	American & Efird, Nelson 02 Plant (Comp)	Lenoir, NC	01/09/09	01/08/09
64843	TDK Components USA, Inc. (Comp)	Peachtree City, GA	01/09/09	01/08/09
64844	Coherent, Inc. (Comp)	Auburn, CA	01/09/09	01/08/09
64845	Reach Road Manufacturing (Wkrs)	Williamsport, PA	01/09/09	12/23/08
64846	Tracker Marine (Wkrs)	Bolivar, MO	01/09/09	01/07/09
64847	Brunswick Family Boat Co., Inc. (State)	Cumberland, MD	01/09/09	01/08/09
64848	Ozark Mountain Apparel—Monett (State)	Monett, MO	01/09/09	01/08/09
64849	Ozark Mountain Apparel—Purdy (State)	Purdy, MO	01/09/09	01/08/09
64850	NCO Financial Systems (Wkrs)	Horsham, PA	01/09/09	12/05/08

[FR Doc. E9-1493 Filed 1-23-09; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-FN-P

## DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training  
Administration

[TA-W-64,208]

Anchor Glass Container Corporation,  
Zanesville Mould Division, Zanesville,  
OH; Notice of Negative Determination  
Regarding Application for  
Reconsideration

By application dated December 29, 2008, United Steelworkers, Local 121 T requested administrative reconsideration of the Department's

negative determination regarding eligibility to apply for Trade Adjustment Assistance (TAA) and Alternative Trade Adjustment Assistance (ATAA), applicable to workers and former workers of the subject firm. The denial notice was signed on November 21, 2008 and published in the **Federal Register** on December 10, 2008 (73 FR 75136).

Pursuant to 29 CFR 90.18(c) reconsideration may be granted under the following circumstances:

(1) If it appears on the basis of facts not previously considered that the determination complained of was erroneous;

(2) If it appears that the determination complained of was based on a mistake

in the determination of facts not previously considered; or

(3) If in the opinion of the Certifying Officer, a mis-interpretation of facts or of the law justified reconsideration of the decision.

The initial investigation that resulted in a negative determination was based on the finding that imports of moulds and related glass container equipment did not contribute importantly to worker separations at the subject facility and there was no shift of production to a foreign country. The subject firm did not import moulds and related glass container equipment during the relevant period. The "contributed importantly" test is generally demonstrated through a survey of the workers' firm's declining

domestic customers. In this case the survey was not conducted because all moulds and related glass container equipment was used internally in the products of glassware. The subject firm did not have external customers in the relevant period and did not import moulds and related glass container equipment.

The petitioner alleged that subject firm's competitors import mould equipment, thus having an advantage over the subject firm in locating potential customers.

The impact of competitors on the domestic firms is revealed in an investigation through customer surveys. In the case at hand, in the absence of the external customers, the Department solicited information from the internal customers of the subject firm to determine if customers purchased imported moulds and related glass container equipment. The information was intended to determine if competitor imports contributed importantly to layoffs at the subject firm. The investigation revealed no imports of moulds and related glass container equipment during the relevant period. The subject firm did not import moulds and related glass container equipment nor was there a shift in production from subject firm abroad during the relevant period.

The petitioner did not supply facts not previously considered; nor provide additional documentation indicating that there was either (1) a mistake in the determination of facts not previously considered or (2) a misinterpretation of facts or of the law justifying reconsideration of the initial determination.

After careful review of the request for reconsideration, the Department determines that 29 CFR 90.18(c) has not been met.

### Conclusion

After review of the application and investigative findings, I conclude that there has been no error or misinterpretation of the law or of the facts which would justify reconsideration of the Department of Labor's prior decision. Accordingly, the application is denied.

Signed in Washington, DC, this 9th day of January 2009.

**Elliott S. Kushner,**

*Certifying Officer, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.*

[FR Doc. E9-1491 Filed 1-23-09; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-FN-P

## DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

### Employment and Training Administration

[TA-W-64,338]

#### **Pine Island Sportswear, Ltd, Monroe, NC; Notice of Negative Determination Regarding Application for Reconsideration**

By application dated January 7, 2009, a company official requested administrative reconsideration of the Department's negative determination regarding eligibility for workers and former workers of the subject firm to apply for Trade Adjustment Assistance (TAA) and Alternative Trade Adjustment Assistance (ATAA). The denial notice was signed on December 2, 2008 and published in the **Federal Register** on December 18, 2008 (73 FR 77068).

Pursuant to 29 CFR 90.18(c) reconsideration may be granted under the following circumstances:

- (1) If it appears on the basis of facts not previously considered that the determination complained of was erroneous;
- (2) If it appears that the determination complained of was based on a mistake in the determination of facts not previously considered; or
- (3) If in the opinion of the Certifying Officer, a misinterpretation of facts or of the law justified reconsideration of the decision.

The TAA petition filed on behalf of workers at Pine Island Sportswear, Ltd., Monroe, North Carolina was based on the finding that the worker group does not produce an article within the meaning of Section 222 of the Trade Act of 1974.

In the request for reconsideration, the petitioner stated that workers of the subject firm were previously certified eligible for Trade Adjustment Assistance. The petitioner further stated that even though production did not occur at the subject facility in the relevant period, workers of the subject firm "should not be denied the same rights as a production employee." The petitioner appears to allege that because the subject firm once manufactured articles and was previously certified eligible for TAA, the workers of the subject firm should be granted another TAA certification.

The workers of Pine Island Sportswear, Ltd., Monroe, North Carolina were previously certified eligible for TAA under petition numbers TA-W-58,714, which expired on January 31, 2008. The investigation

revealed that production at the subject firm ceased in February 2006.

When assessing eligibility for TAA, the Department exclusively considers production during the relevant time period (from one year prior to the date of the petition). Therefore, events occurring in 2006 are outside of the relevant period and are not considered in this investigation.

The investigation revealed that workers of the subject firm were engaged in work related to administrative and distribution during the relevant period. These functions, as described above, are not considered to be production of an article within the meaning of Section 222 of the Trade Act.

The petitioner did not supply facts not previously considered; nor provide additional documentation indicating that there was either (1) a mistake in the determination of facts not previously considered or (2) a misinterpretation of facts or of the law justifying reconsideration of the initial determination.

After careful review of the request for reconsideration, the Department determines that 29 CFR 90.18(c) has not been met.

### Conclusion

After review of the application and investigative findings, I conclude that there has been no error or misinterpretation of the law or of the facts which would justify reconsideration of the Department of Labor's prior decision. Accordingly, the application is denied.

Signed at Washington, DC, this 14th day of January 2009.

**Elliott S. Kushner,**

*Certifying Officer, Division of Trade Adjustment Assistance.*

[FR Doc. E9-1495 Filed 1-23-09; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-FN-P

## DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

### Employment and Training Administration

[TA-W-63,976]

#### **Stauble Machine and Tool Co., Inc.: Louisville, KY; Notice of Revised Determination on Reconsideration**

On December 10, 2008, the Department issued an Affirmative Determination Regarding Application on Reconsideration applicable to workers and former workers of the subject firm. The notice was published in the **Federal Register** on December 18, 2008 (73 FR 77064).